

FY 2017
SMALL NEPA PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests

Please **do not leave any field BLANK**, unless it does not apply.
Submit form (Word doc) electronically to jjchynoweth@fs.fed.us by **May 5, 2017**.

(NOTE: Italicized comments are for reference only. You may delete them when completing form.)

Project Name	Forestwide AML Closures
District name (or "Forestwide")	Forestwide
County(ies) where project located?	Latah County, Idaho County, Clearwater County
FS Personnel Name, Phone Number and Email <i>If a partnership, please add name, phone and email, but <u>an FS employee MUST be the project proponent and point of contact.</u></i>	Rebecca Anderson: 476-8351 rebeccaanderson@fs.fed.us Marty Jones: 983-5158 martinjones@fs.fed.us
Legal Location <i>Township(s), Range(s), and Section(s) must be entered.</i>	See Last Page.
District Ranger / Line Officer's Name <i>Person(s) responsible for signing the decision document</i>	Cheryl F. Probert
Is the project associated with meeting a Forest target?	Yes
Watershed and subwatershed the project is located?	See Last Page.

<p>Which CE Category does this project fit?*</p> <p><i>Provide citation: 36CFR 220.6(d)(x) or 36 CFR 220.6(e)(x)</i></p> <p><i>See - O:\NFS\NezPerceClearwater\Project\MultiBasin\Planning\Small_NEPA_Cat_Ex\Reference Material\CE Categories</i></p>	<p>36 CFR 220.6(e)(8) Short-term (1 year or less) mineral, energy, or geophysical investigations and their incidental support activities that may require cross-country travel by vehicles and equipment, construction of less than 1 mile of low standard road, or use and minor repair of existing roads. Examples include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Authorizing geophysical investigations which use existing roads that may require incidental repair to reach sites for drilling core holes, temperature gradient holes, or seismic shot holes; (ii) Gathering geophysical data using shot hole, vibroseis, or surface charge methods; (iii) Trenching to obtain evidence of mineralization; (iv) Clearing vegetation for sight paths or from areas used for investigation or support facilities; (v) Redesigning or rearranging surface facilities within an approved site; (vi) Approving interim and final site restoration measures; and (vii) Approving a plan for exploration which authorizes repair of an existing road and the construction of 1/3 mile of temporary road; clearing vegetation from an acre of land for trenches, drill pads, or support facilities.
<p>* Projects that fit in a “36 CFR 220.6 (d)” category <u>do not require a written Project Record or a Decision document.</u> <i>(See - O:\NFS\NezPerceClearwater\Project\MultiBasin\Planning\Small_NEPA_Cat_Ex\Reference Material\CE Categories)</i></p> <p>Do you want to submit the project for consideration in the Small NEPA process? Y <u>x</u> N <u> </u></p> <p>If no, this form does not need to be submitted to the Small NEPA planner.</p> <p>If yes, see instructions below regarding scoping level.</p>	

*** If the project fits under a “36 CFR 220.6(e)” category (Project Record and Decision required), or is being submitted for small nepa consideration under a “36 CFR 220.6 (d)” category, at what level should the project be scoped?**

Internal X External

Internal scoping would be through the Small NEPA IDT, unless otherwise specified. Scoping would be documented in the Extraordinary Circumstances Checklist.

External scoping would be with the public via a scoping letter, a legal notice, the scoping letter posted on the NPCWNF website, and postcards with a link to the website/scoping letter. The scoping letter/postcards will be mailed to the full NEPA mailing list unless otherwise specified.

List the Management Area(s) in which your project is located.

See Last Page

See O:\NFS\NezPerceClearwater\Project\MultiBasin\Planning\Small_NEPA_Cat_Ex\Reference Material\Management Areas

What are the desired conditions for the Management Area(s)?

Desired conditions described in Chapters 2 & 3 of the Nez Perce and Clearwater Forest Plans. List those that apply.

Palouse: *E1*

This, the largest block MANAGEMENT AREA E1 (503,567 Acres) of land within -the Forest, contains generally the most productive timber land in the Forest. The area contains approximately 422,390 acres that have been developed for timber harvest in the past and approximately 81,177 acres of presently undeveloped land. Productivity potential ranges from 20 cubic feet per acre per year to over 170 cubic feet per acre per year. Most of the area IS also suitable big-game summer range with white-tailed deer the predominant species in the Palouse District and elk the predominant species in the rest of the Forest. The area also contains considerable sections of intermingled private land in the Powell, Kelly Creek, and Palouse Districts. In many drainages in the Palouse District, the E1 lands occupy less acreage than the Intermingled private land. A large block of private land is also found intermingled with E1 land

Goals

Provide optimum, sustained production of wood products. Timber production is to be cost effective and provide adequate protection of soil and water quality. Manage viable elk populations within areas of historic elk use based on physiological and ecological needs. Manage a range of water quality and fish habitat potential from high fishable in several of the key anadromous and resident fish streams to a low fishable in the Palouse District and portions of the Pierce District.

Minerals

Provide for access to and the orderly exploration, development and production of minerals and energy resources, while meeting Forest Plan direction for other resources.

Lochsa-Powell: *E1 (Pioneer) and M1 (Canyon Creek)*

This, the largest block MANAGEMENT AREA E1 (503,567 Acres) of land within -the Forest, contains generally the most productive timber land in the Forest. The area contains approximately 422,390 acres that have been developed for timber harvest in the past and approximately 81,177 acres of presently undeveloped land. Productivity potential ranges from 20 cubic feet per acre per year to over 170 cubic feet per acre per year. Most of the area IS also suitable big-game summer range with white-tailed deer the predominant species in the Palouse District and elk the predominant species in the rest of the Forest. The area also contains considerable sections of intermingled private land in the Powell, Kelly Creek, and Palouse Districts. In many drainages in the Palouse District, the E1 lands occupy less acreage than the Intermingled private land. A large block of private land is also found intermingled with E1 land

Goals

Provide optimum, sustained production of wood products. Timber production is to be cost effective and provide adequate protection of soil and water quality. Manage viable elk populations within areas of historic elk use based on physiological and ecological needs. Manage a range of water quality and fish habitat potential from high fishable in several of the key anadromous and resident fish streams to a low fishable in the Palouse District and portions of the Pierce District.

Minerals

Provide for access to and the orderly exploration, development and production of minerals and energy resources, while meeting Forest Plan direction for other resources.

Management Area M1 consists of existing and proposed research natural areas (RNAs) and special interest biological, botanical, and geological areas.

Goals

Manage established and proposed RNAs to protect their inherent natural features and maintain them in undisturbed ecosystems. Manage special interest areas to protect their special features.

Is the project in a Roadless Area? Yes* No X

** If yes, answer the questions in the 'Project in Roadless Area' table below, **AND** complete a Briefing Paper - note special requirements for maps. Provide the completed Briefing Paper to Environmental Coordinator and Brian Riggers prior to scoping.*

(See O:\NFS\NezPerceClearwater\Project\MultiBasin\Planning\Small_NEPA_Cat_Ex\Reference Material\Roadless Rule Info\General Roadless Info for Briefing Paper Info and Template.)

Is the project in a congressionally designated area, ex. Wilderness, Wild & Scenic River Corridor, Research Natural Area, Historic Trail, etc.? Yes*X No

If yes, which one(s)? The Canyon Creek adit is within RNA.

** If yes, you must contact Carol Hennessey, cahennessey@fs.fed.us, 935-4270, BEFORE submitting this proposal, to discuss how the project may affect the area.*

1987 Forest Plan maps are found at O:\NFS\NezPerceClearwater\Project\MultiBasin\Planning\Small_NEPA_Cat_Ex\Reference Material\Management Areas

Does the project involve road construction, reconstruction, temporary roads, or haul routes?

Yes* No X

** If yes, answer the questions in the 'Project Involving Road Construction, Reconstruction, Temporary Roads, or Haul Routes' table below.*

Are Municipal Watersheds located in the project area? Yes No X

If yes, which one(s)?

Are there Floodplains or Wetlands in the project area? Yes No X

Is the project located in an RHCA? Yes No X

Is the project in the Hell's Canyon National Recreation Area? Yes No X

Describe the existing condition(s) of the project area.

What is the Purpose and Need for the proposed action? *The purpose and need describes - Why the action is being proposed at this location and at this time (need) and the desired objectives/outcomes of the action (purpose).*

The purpose of this project is to permanently close open shafts and/or adits at abandoned mine sites using standard closure methods. The project is needed to eliminate public safety risks associated with existing mine openings, while maintaining wildlife habitat (where needed) and the historical integrity of the sites. Abandoned mine adits and shafts typically contain hazards such as unstable rock and decayed supports, deadly gas and lack of oxygen, explosive and toxic chemicals, hidden vertical drops and the potential for becoming lost in multiple dark tunnels. Shafts pose a particular hazard as they can be easily walked or driven into by unsuspecting forest users who can then be trapped, seriously injured or even killed by what could be a very long fall.

Describe the Proposed Action:

What is provided below will be used to create the Scoping Letter, by the resource specialists to conduct their effects analyses, and for writing the Decision document so be thorough, detailed, and descriptive. Please include all project-related activities that may have an impact on the environment.

Please describe the PA in full sentences and narrative paragraphs by answering the following:

The work will be done by Jason Ringenberg, AML Closure Specialist for Minerals and Geology Management. He has a crew that will perform the work which will take place at each site. The sites listed are all either on forest roads or have access roads to them. Various methods will be used to close the AML sites depending on the conditions present. Equipment used for this project would include ATVs and trailers, portable gas powered electric generator, electric cutoff saw, electric welder, steel bar stock and square tubing for constructing the gate, and appropriate hand tools. Ground disturbance for this closure would be nil; only a minor amount of material would need to be moved from the portal by hand digging. Funding has been allocated for these projects and they would be implemented Summer 2018. No additional permits should be needed for these projects, and no coordination with other agencies should be required. Mining claimants who potentially could be affected by these activities will be notified. Ground disturbance due to these activities will be very minor, as there may be some hand digging required to move rock debris out of the way to build and fit the gates. Each project site is estimated to take a couple of days. Mine closures will be monitored periodically to ensure integrity and effectiveness.

List the design criteria/mitigation measures to be included with the proposed action.

Additional design criteria/measures can be listed on the last page of this form. If these are not provided, the form will be returned.

Reclamation alternatives should consider the size and stability of the opening, the type of material around it, its depth to competent rock, the effects of site drainage, mine ventilation, near surface mine workings, safety of construction, access, site disturbance during construction, requirements for protection of threatened/endangered species and/or historic preservation, and any other factors that may affect the reclamation method or the construction effort.

Three general types of approaches are used for safeguarding shafts, stopes, and adits. Barriers are designed to keep visitors away from the hazard. Seals prevent entry to the mine. Plugs eliminate the hazard altogether. Alternatives should be evaluated for a number of factors, such as: Life span – will it be effective permanently, 50 years, 10 years? Degree of hazard elimination – Completely eliminate it, provide a barrier or deterrent Maintenance requirements – How prone is the closure to vandalism and environmental degradation? Construction safety – Is it safe for workers, and does it require special skills or equipment? Is methane being produced by the mine? Is the mine atmosphere safe? Are there overhanging and /or loose rocks around the opening? Is this a uranium or vanadium mine requiring special health protection from radiation during construction? Environmental concerns – Water quality and drainage. Is the site in a wetland area, near a stream? What will be disturbed to install the closure? Are there bats or other wildlife that may use opening for protection? Will there be loss of vegetation? Design concerns – Is the closure method feasible to install? If competent rock is needed for anchoring grating or bedding concrete caps, is it close to the surface? Access for equipment—Is the site accessible by heavy equipment, or only by foot? Size of equipment needed – Depends on closure method and site access? Availability of materials— Are materials easily available and cost effective? Cultural resources – Is it in an historic area, is the building significant, in ruins? Cost - Is the cost prohibitive? Reasonable?

List the Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be included with the proposed action.

Additional BMPs can be listed under "Additional Information" on the last page of this form. If these are not provided, the form will be returned.

BMP # 11 – BARRIERS

Description and purpose

Barriers can be appropriate when the opening is too large for other alternatives and when construction access is restricted. Barriers include fences of several types and grates made of steel bars. Chain link and iron fences can be effective at keeping casual visitors a safe distance from hazardous openings. Steel grates, using industrial grade material similar to that used for elevated walkways, can be installed over vertical openings or in the portal of horizontal openings. A locking door made out of the steel grating can be incorporated to allow continued access to the mine workings by the landowner or authorized people. Alternative methods involve placing a corrugated steel pipe in the adit and installing a grate on the outer end, or using a special grate of steel bars to allow for bat access.

Considerations

Barriers such as fences and grates should be recognized for exactly what they are – barriers. They are not intended to prevent entry by the determined visitor. The advantages of fences are that they are safe to install with no exposure to the mine hazard, they disturb the site minimally, they are easy to install, and they are relatively inexpensive. The disadvantages of fences are that they are temporary, they don't eliminate the hazard but just discourage access, they are subject to vandalism, and they can be aesthetically intrusive in otherwise natural settings. When fences are used they must be located far enough away from the hazardous opening to survive erosion of the feature. Steel grates, whether they are installed over a vertical shaft or at the portal of a horizontal mine opening, are more permanent and more of a deterrent than fencing. Advantages of grates are their somewhat long life (approximately 50 years), total elimination of access to the hazard, they involve little to no site disturbance, they can be installed in remote or difficult access situations, they allow continued ventilation of the mine workings, they can be designed to allow continued use of the mine by bats, and they are relatively low cost. Disadvantages include exposure to vandalism and corrosion over time, the necessity to protect workers from falling, unstable roofs, unsafe mine atmospheres during construction, and the need to have competent rock to anchor the grating in most situations.

Initial costs

The cost of fences and barriers will vary depending on their length or size, the accessibility of necessary construction equipment, and the strength of the materials used. Fences are generally low cost with barbed wire being the cheapest, chain link being moderate in cost, and ornamental iron fences being most expensive. Grates are moderate in cost.

Maintenance

Periodic inspection and maintenance is required for continued effectiveness of this type of safeguard. They are especially susceptible to vandalism and the types of materials used defines their ultimate longevity.

BMP # 12 – PLUGS

Description and purpose

Plugs include backfills, monolithic plugs, and plugs utilizing polyurethane foam (PUF). They are designed to eliminate the hazard completely.

How to do it

Shafts, stopes, and subsidence features should be backfilled using graded materials, i.e., placing large rock riprap in the bottom of the feature, followed by successively smaller diameter materials with a plant growth media on the surface to allow for revegetation. Adits should be backfilled with a minimum depth of fifteen feet from the inner top of the fill to the outer top of the fill. Monolithic plugs consist of pouring a four foot (4') thick concrete cap over mine shafts that have collapsed at the collar and have no apparent opening. The visible bottom of the usually shallow pit is most likely a false plug that will fail in the future. This work includes near surface excavation, furnishing and installing riprap, furnishing and installing concrete, backfilling, and revegetating disturbed areas. A PUF closure uses a column of polyurethane foam placed several feet down into a vertical opening with mine waste or common fill material placed on top of

Specific individuals/groups/businesses* (with mailing addresses) in the district(s) impacted by the project who should be contacted during the Scoping Process. Do not provide just a name.

(* NOTE: tribal / state / county governments and agencies will already be contacted)

Please attach to your project submission email, separate from this form, a GIS-generated map or maps of the project area (pdf format only) per the instructions outlined below. Do not give links to maps or datasets. Please make sure that the layers can be turned on/off on your PDF map(s).

At least one map, with (preferably) a “portrait” orientation, showing the project location/activities as points, e.g. culvert, mineral exploration site, etc.; lines, e.g. fence, road, creek, etc.; and/or the project boundary as a polygon, e.g. stand, treatment area, etc. Do not use a point when treating an area, use a polygon.

The map(s) needs to include identifying features, such as towns, roads, trails, rivers/streams, geophysical landmarks, etc. to identify where the project is on the landscape

Please use the Forest Visitor Map as your map’s base layer (see below*). This will standardize the appearance of the maps for scoping. Please do not add contour lines to the map unless needed. Contour lines make the map difficult to read. A topo map may be used as a substitute for the FV Map, as long as there are sufficient identifying features on the base layer that can be used to identify the project’s location. If contour lines are not important to defining the location they should be turned off.

The preferred (not required) scale is 1:24000. If the project area can’t be adequately shown at 1:24K, use a larger scale (> 1:24K) showing the entire project area and if needed, provide additional maps showing details of the project activities. **Please make as few maps as possible.** Conversely, if the 1:24K scale is too large (i.e. the project / action area is a tiny point or a thin line hard to find on a large landscape), use a smaller scale (< 1:24K) to provide more detail while ensuring that the project area’s/activities’ location is identifiable.

All maps should include, at a minimum, a **Title** (i.e. include only the district and the project name); a **Legend** with the project feature(s) clearly labeled, e.g. culvert replacement, fence line, x treatment area, etc.; a **Scale** in miles (not km) using full miles, such as 0_0.25_0.5_1.0 miles (ending with 0.5 miles okay); and a **North arrow**. Use a black outlined box with a white background (not gray) to display them.

The main point is, the map(s) are used mostly for scoping purposes (see Shapefiles below), to show the public, as clearly and efficiently as possible, what activity or activities are being proposed and where the activity or activities are located on the Forest.

** The Small NEPA geodatabase contains feature classes, including the Forest Visitor Map, that can be used for map creation. The geodatabase is found at:*

T:\FS\NFS\NezPerceClearwater\Project\MultiBasin\Planning\Small_NEPA_Cat_Ex\GIS\SmallNEPA.gdb

If you need help with accessing and/or working with the geodatabase in GIS, contact your Zone GIS Specialist (first) or you can contact Jim Lutes at jamesrlutes@fs.fed.us; 963-4202.

SHAPEFILES

The resource specialists want the shapefile(s) of the project’s proposed activity(ies) before they will begin their analyses. The shapefile(s) need to be labeled with a Project Name and the Feature. For example, Peasley culvert replace, Brushy Fork road decom, PC thinning _NFRD, etc. The shapefile(s) must follow these instructions* or they will not be accepted and the project will delayed until they are met.

*The Project Proponent needs to send the shapefile including the following extensions – .dbf, .prj, .sbn, .shp, .shx, and .xml – to jjchynoweth@fs.fed.us prior to or when the District Ranger submits this form.

Note: Providing where the shapefile(s) can be found (O drive/T drive) does not meet this obligation. Providing the shapefile(s) **does not substitute** for providing the map(s).

Small NEPA IDT/resource specialists are listed below. Contact them if you have any questions regarding their resource and your project.

Botany – Mike Hays, mhays01@fs.fed.us; 983-4028

Cultural – Steve Lucas, slucas@fs.fed.us; 983-4040

Fisheries – Christine Stewart, christinestewart@fs.fed.us; 963-4211

Fisheries (detail) – Tim Price, tprice@fs.fed.us; 935-2513 (main office number)

Hydrology – Cynthia Valle, cvalle@fs.fed.us; 963-4203

Minerals – Marty Jones, martinjones@fs.fed.us; 983-5158

Recreation – Carol Hennessey, cahennessey@fs.fed.us; 935-4270

Soils – Robert Bergstrom, robertbergstrom@fs.fed.us; 963-4287

Wildlife – Jim Lutes, jamesrlutes@fs.fed.us; 963-4202

Project in Roadless Area

<p>What is the Roadless Area name?</p> <p><i>O:\NFS\NezPerceClearwater\Project\MultiBasin\Planning\Small_NEPA_Cat_Ex\Reference Material\Roadless Rule Info</i></p>	<p>Idaho Roadless Area (IRA) Name:</p> <p>Forest Plan IRA Name (if different):</p>
<p>Identify the Idaho Roadless Management classification because permitted activities vary by classification.</p> <p><i>Classifications include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wild Land Recreation</i> • <i>Special Areas of Historic or Tribal Significance</i> • <i>Primitive</i> • <i>Backcountry Restoration</i> • <i>General Forest, Rangeland and Grassland</i> 	<p>Classification:</p>
<p>Does the project involve constructing or reconstructing roads? Yes* No</p> <p><i>* If yes, see http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2011-title36-vol2 then navigate to Subpart C 294.23</i></p>	
<p>Does the project involve cutting trees? Yes* No</p> <p><i>* If yes, see http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2011-title36-vol2 then navigate to Subpart C 294.24</i></p>	
<p>Does the project involve removing minerals, including common variety minerals? Yes* No</p> <p><i>* If yes, see http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2011-title36-vol2 then navigate to Subpart C 294.25</i></p>	

Project Involving Road Construction, Reconstruction, Temporary Roads, and/or Haul Routes

Note: Specialists will address items 9-11 (*in italics*) below.

ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS	YES / NO	MITIGATION MEASURE/COMMENTS
1. Will road construction or reconstruction be required? Type of road and length.		
2. Will temporary roads be needed?		
3. Will road maintenance be needed? Who will perform?		
4. Will there be a change to the current road restrictions?		
5. Are haul roads part of an established snowmobile network?		
6. Are there public safety concerns for roads, trails, or other road improvements?		
7. Are there other improvements which will require protection?		
8. Does the area currently meet Forest Plan standards for soils?		
9. <i>Will the project impact elk security?</i>		
10. <i>Will the project or log haul impact winter range?</i>		
11. <i>Will the project impact critical elk summer range?</i>		

JC : 8/19/2016

Additional Information:

List of Potential AML Closures

<u>Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Watershed</u>	<u>Mgmt Area</u>	
Gold Quartz 5	T43N R1W, Sec. 31	Adit	Deep Creek/Palouse River	E1	
Pioneer	T35N R6E, Sec. 3	Shaft	Lolo Creek	E1	
Canyon Creek	T33N R7E, Sec. 11	Adit(s)	Lower Lochsa	C4	
Ophir	T29N R5E, Sec. 19	Adit	Upper South Fork Clearwater	12	
Windjammer	T25N R4E, Sec. 7	Adit	Slate Creek	12	
Badger #1	T27N R8E, Sec. 19	Shaft	Crooked River	12	
Badger #2	T27N R8E, Sec. 19	Shaft	Crooked River	12	
Miner's Ditch Trail	T28N R7E, Sec. 35	Adit	Crooked River	12	
Altemont Mine	T29 R9E, Sec. 34	Adit	Red River	12	

T43N, R1W, Sec. 31; T35N, R6E, Sec. 3; T33N, R7E, Sec. 11; T29N, R9E, Sec. 34; T29N, R5E, Sec. 19; T28N, R7E, Sec. 35; T27N, R8E, Sec. 19; T25N, R4E, Sec. 7; Clearwater, Idaho, Latah Cos., Idaho